RECEIVED
Public Information Office

OCT 2 2015

# Before the UNITED STATES COPYRIGHT ROYALTY JUDGES THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS Washington, D.C.

COPYRIGHT OFFICE

In the Matter of

DETERMINATION OF ROYALTY RATES FOR DIGITAL PERFORMANCE IN SOUND RECORDINGS AND EPHEMERAL RECORDINGS (WEB IV) Docket No. 14-CRB-0001-WR (2016–2020)

#### iHEARTMEDIA, INC.'S INITIAL BRIEF REGARDING THE NOVEL LEGAL QUESTION REFERRED TO THE REGISTER ON DIFFERENT LICENSOR RATES

Section 114 states that the schedule of reasonable rates and terms "shall... be binding on all copyright owners of sound recordings and entities performing sound recordings." 17 U.S.C. § 114(f)(2)(B). Section 114 expressly provides for different rates and terms for different types of *licensees* — based on the quantity and nature of their use of sound recordings, how the licensee services promote or substitute for other sales, and other factors — but it does not provide at all for different rates and terms for different types of *licensors*. *See id.* A construction of Section 114 that equates that absence of authorization with an express authorization to differentiate among types of licensors — reading silence as implied authority — would clash with the text and structure of the statute. Had Congress wanted the Judges to differentiate among licensors, it would have said so, just as it did for licensees. And had Congress wanted the Judges to differentiate among licensors, it would have provided the criteria for doing so, just as it did for licensees.

Differentiating among licensors would also clash with "Congress's expectation that [the Judges] would designate a *single* entity" to act as a representative of *all* copyright holders.

Intercollegiate Broad. Sys., Inc. v. Copyright Royalty Bd., 574 F.3d 748, 771 (D.C. Cir. 2009) (emphasis added) (noting that the statute refers repeatedly to "a single 'entity' to receive royalty payments"). The Judges, moreover, have found that having a "single Collective" is the "most economically and administratively efficient system for collecting royalties under the blanket license framework created by the statutory licenses." Final Rule and Order, Digital Performance Right in Sound Recordings and Ephemeral Recordings, Docket No. 2005-1 CRB DTRA, 72 Fed. Reg. 24084, 24104 (May 1, 2007). As counsel for SoundExchange noted at the closing argument before the Judges, "SoundExchange . . . represent[s] all of them" — all copyright holders — in the proceedings before the Judges. Tr. at 7744:14 (Pomerantz). Differentiating among licensors would create conflicts of interest within SoundExchange, preventing the use of a single collective in conflict with both Congress's expectations as reflected in the statute and the recognized efficiencies of having a single collective. Cf. In re Diet Drugs (Phentermine/ Fenfluramine/Dexfenfluramine) Prods. Liab. Litig., 385 F.3d 386, 395 (3d Cir. 2004) (holding that "class members with divergent or conflicting interests cannot be adequately represented by the same named plaintiffs") (citing Amchem Prods. v. Windsor, 521 U.S. 591, 625-26 (1997)).

More broadly, differentiating among licensors conflicts with the remainder of Section 114, which does not distinguish between different types of copyright holders under the statutory license. For example, the criteria for defining which "performance[s] of a sound recording" are subject to statutory licensing do not depend on characteristics of the copyright holder, such as whether the copyright holder is a major label or a small independent. 17 U.S.C. § 114(d)(2). By contrast, in the immediately following subsection — which relates to *interactive* services that are *not* eligible for the statutory license — Congress distinguished between licensors based on their size: namely, whether the licensor holds the copyright to one thousand or fewer sound

recordings. See id. § 114(d)(3)(A). Congress thus "knew how to distinguish between" licensors based on their size, "but chose not to do so in" Section 114(f)(2)(B). Department of Homeland Sec. v. MacLean, 135 S. Ct. 913, 921 (2015). That decision must be respected.

Creating new distinctions between types of licensors would add considerable administrative difficulty for the Judges and the participants, and should not be lightly undertaken. Differentiating licensors would not simply add to the Judges' burden in these proceedings, but actually would multiply it. If there are n types of licensors and m types of licensees, the total number of rates to determine would be n times m, because each licensor may deal with each licensee. It is a familiar principle that a statute should be read to avoid compounding administrative difficulties. *See*, *e.g.*, *Verizon Communications Inc.* v. *Law Offices of Curtis V. Trinko*, *LLP*, 540 U.S. 398, 414-15 (2004) (holding that antitrust courts' difficulty setting remedial terms for dealing with rivals was a consideration in limiting duties to deal). Similar burdens of administration would apply to the participants.

Accordingly, as SoundExchange's counsel explained at the hearing, the CRB has never set rates that distinguish between different types of licensors.

[A]t the end of the day, because you have to try to come up with a statutory license that's workable and if — you would have to then define what would be a major versus what would be an indie for the next five years, I think that what has happened historically is that I believe the judges either expressly or at least implicitly have done some sort of weighting, and that's what we propose here.

Tr. at 7744:18-7745:1 (Pomerantz); see id. at 7745:2-4 (Judge Strickler, "agree[ing]" with SoundExchange's counsel that "what . . . has been done before" is establish statutory license terms that do not distinguish between licensors).

For these reasons, iHeartMedia submits that the best reading of the statute is one that establishes rates and terms without regard to specific characteristics of particular licensors.

Dated: October 2, 2015

## Respectfully submitted,

#### /s/ John Thorne

Mark C. Hansen
John Thorne
Scott H. Angstreich
KELLOGG, HUBER, HANSEN, TODD,
EVANS & FIGEL, P.L.L.C.
1615 M Street, NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036
mhansen@khhte.com
jthorne@khhte.com
sangstreich@khhte.com
Telephone: (202) 326-7900

Telephone: (202) 326-7900 Facsimile: (202) 326-7999

Counsel for iHeartMedia, Inc.

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, John Thorne, hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing Initial Brief Regarding the Novel Legal Questions Referred to The Register on Different Licensor Rates of iHeartMedia, Inc. has been served on this 2nd day of October 2015 on the following persons:

Kurt Hanson	Jeffrey J. Jarmuth
AccuRadio, LLC	Law Offices of Jeffrey J. Jarmuth
65 E. Wacker Place, Suite 930	34 E. Elm Street
Chicago, IL 60601	Chicago, IL 60611-1016
kurt@accuradio.com	jeff.jarmuth@jarmuthlawoffices.com
AccuRadio, LLC	Counsel for AccuRadio, LLC
Catherine R. Gellis	David D. Golden
CGCounsel	Constantine Cannon LLP
P.O. Box 2477	1001 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Suite 1300N
Sausalito, CA 94966	Washington, DC 20004
cathy@cgcounsel.com	dgolden@constantinecannon.com
College Broadcasters, Inc.	Counsel for College Broadcasters, Inc.
Kevin Blair	David Oxenford
Brian Gantman	Wilkinson Barker Knauer, LLP
Educational Media Foundation	2300 N Street, NW, Suite 700
5700 West Oaks Boulevard	Washington, DC 20037
Rocklin, CA 95765	doxenford@wbklaw.com
kblair@kloveair1.com	
bgantman@kloveair1.com	
	Counsel for Educational Media Foundation and
Educational Media Foundation	National Association of Broadcasters
George D. Johnson	William Malone
GEO Music Group	40 Cobbler's Green
23 Music Square East, Suite 204	205 Main Street
Nashville, TN 37203	New Canaan, CT 06840-5636
george@georgejohnson.com	malone@ieee.org
GEO Music Group	Harvard Radio Broadcasting Co., Inc. and Intercollegiate Broadcasting System, Inc.

Frederick J. Kass	Suzanne Head
Intercollegiate Broadcasting System, Inc.	National Association of Broadcasters
367 Windsor Highway	1771 N Street, NW
New Windsor, NY 12553-7900	Washington, DC 20036
ibs@ibsradio.org	jmago@nab.org
ibshq@aol.com	shead@nab.org
Intercollegiate Broadcasting System, Inc.	National Association of Broadcasters
inter conegitate 21 caucasting 2 years, inc.	Transcriber 1255 containers of 21 containers
Jane Mago	Bruce G. Joseph
4154 Cortland Way	Karyn K. Ablin
Naples, Florida 34119	Michael L. Sturm
jem@jmago.net	Wiley Rein LLP
John Jinago.net	1776 K Street, NW
	Washington, DC 20006
	bjoseph@wileyrein.com
	, · · ·
	kablin@wileyrein.com
	msturm@wileyrein.com
Comment from North and American of	Comment for Mational Association of
Counsel for National Association of	Counsel for National Association of
Broadcasters	Broadcasters
Cracery A. Levvia	Kenneth L. Steinthal
Gregory A. Lewis	
National Public Radio, Inc.	Joseph R. Wetzel
1111 North Capitol Street, NE	King & Spalding LLP
Washington, DC 20002	101 Second Street, Suite 2300
glewis@npr.org	San Francisco, CA 94105
	ksteinthal@kslaw.com
	jwetzel@kslaw.com
N	
National Public Radio, Inc.	Counsel for National Public Radio, Inc.
Ethan Davis	Antonio E. Lewis
King & Spalding LLP	King & Spalding, LLP
1700 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW	100 N. Tyron Street
Suite 200	Suite 3900
Washington, DC 20006	Charlotte, NC 28202
edavis@kslaw.com	alewis@kslaw.com
Counsel for National Public Radio, Inc.	Counsel for National Public Radio, Inc.
Comment for Prantoman 1 none name, me.	Comment for Transfer I nome Runto, Inc.

Russ Hauth, Executive Director Harv Hendrickson, Chairman National Religious Broadcasters Noncommercial Music License Committee 3003 Snelling Avenue North Saint Paul, MN 55113 russh@salem.cc hphendrickson@unwsp.edu  National Religious Broadcasters Noncommercial Music License Committee	Karyn K. Ablin Jennifer L. Elgin Wiley Rein LLP 1776 K St. NW Washington, DC 20006 kablin@wileyrein.com jelgin@wileyrein.com  Counsel for National Religious Broadcasters Noncommercial Music License Committee
Christopher Harrison Pandora Media, Inc. 2101 Webster Street, Suite 1650 Oakland, CA 94612 charrison@pandora.com	R. Bruce Rich Todd D. Larson Sabrina A. Perelman Benjamin E. Marks David E. Yolkut Elisabeth M. Sperle Reed Collins Jacob B. Ebin Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP 767 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10153 r.bruce.rich@weil.com todd.larson@weil.com sabrina.perelman@weil.com benjamin.marks@weil.com david.yolkut@weil.com elisabeth.sperle@weil.com reed.collins@weil.com Jacob.ebin@weil.com
Pandora Media, Inc.	Counsel for Pandora Media, Inc.
Gary R. Greenstein Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati 1700 K Street, NW, 5th Floor Washington, DC 20006 ggreenstein@wsgr.com	Cynthia Greer Sirius XM Radio Inc. 1500 Eckington Pl. NE Washington, DC 20002 cynthia.greer@siriusxm.com
Counsel for Pandora Media, Inc.	Sirius XM Radio Inc.

Patrick Donnelly	Paul Fakler
Sirius XM Radio Inc.	Arent Fox LLP
1221 Avenue of the Americas	1675 Broadway
36 <sup>th</sup> Floor	New York, NY 10019
New York, NY 10020	paul.fakler@arentfox.com
patrick.donnelly@siriusxm.com	
Sirius XM Radio Inc.	Counsel for Sirius XM Radio Inc.
Martin F. Cunniff	C. Colin Rushing
Jackson D. Toof	Bradley E. Prendergast
Arent Fox LLP	SoundExchange, Inc.
1717 K Street, NW	733 10th Street, NW, 10th Floor
Washington, DC 20006	Washington, DC 20001
martin.cunniff@arentfox.com	crushing@soundexchange.com
jackson.toof@arentfox.com	bprendergast@soundexchange.com
,	
Counsel for Sirius XM Radio Inc.	SoundExchange, Inc.
Glenn D. Pomerantz	
Kelly M. Klaus	
Anjan Choudhury	
Melinda E. LeMoine	
Kuruvilla J. Olasa	
Jonathan Blavin	
Rose Leda Ehler	
Jennifer L. Bryant	
Munger, Tolles & Olson LLP	
355 S. Grand Avenue, 35th Floor	
Los Angeles, CA 90071-1560	
Glenn.Pomerantz@mto.com	
Kelly.Klaus@mto.com	
Anjan.Choudhury@mto.com	
Melinda.LeMoine@mto.com	
Kuruvilla.Olasa@mto.com	
Jonathan.Blavin@mto.com	
Rose.Ehler@mto.com	
Jennifer.Bryant@mto.com	
Coursel for Course Exchange Inc	
Counsel for SoundExchange, Inc.	

/s/ John Thorne

John Thorne KELLOGG, HUBER, HANSEN, TODD, EVANS & FIGEL, P.L.L.C. 1615 M Street, NW, Suite 400 Washington, DC 20036 jthorne@khhte.com

Telephone: (202) 326-7900 Facsimile: (202) 326-7999

Counsel for iHeartMedia, Inc.

0